

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/698,143
Attorney Docket No. Q60866

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Pending claims 2, 9, 13, 18, 20-25, 27-31, 33 and 35-46 have been examined. Claims 2, 9, 13, 18, 20-25, 27-31, 35-44 and 46 are allowed. Claims 33 and 45, however, are rejected. Specifically, claims 33 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,336,719 to Ishinaga et al. (hereinafter “Ishinaga”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,302,527 to Walker.

By way of overview, Applicant overcomes the rejection of claims 33 and 45 as set forth herein, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 9, 13, 18, 20-25, 27-31, 35-44 and 46 are allowed.

III. Examiner Interview of October 26, 2004

Applicant’s representative conducted a telephonic interview with Primary Examiner M. Nghiem of the U.S. Patent Office on October 26, 2004. During the interview, rejected claims 33 and 45 were discussed in relation to the applied Ishinaga reference. The Examiner explained his position with respect to the term “isolated,” as used in claims 33 and 45.

Applicant’s representative proposed clarifying amendments to claims 33 and 45, which the Examiner agreed would distinguish the subject matter of claims 33 and 45 from the applied combination of Ishinaga in view of Walker.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/698,143
Attorney Docket No. Q60866

No further issues were discussed during the interview.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As noted above, claims 33 and 45 stand rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ishinaga in view of Walker.

Applicant amends claims 33 to recite, *inter alia*, that “at least one of said areas is a first area storing ink and at least one of said areas is a second area, which is not in communication with said first area and is isolated from the stored ink.” Claim 45 is amended in a similar fashion.

It is respectfully submitted that Ishinaga and Walker, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest dividing an internal space of a container body into a plurality of areas by walls, such that at least one of the areas is a first area that stores ink and at least one of the areas is a second area, which does not communicate with the first area and is isolated from the stored ink.

Thus, claims 33 and 45 are not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Ishinaga and Walker.

V. Formal Matter – Information Disclosure Statements

The Examiner provides a signed and initialed copy of the Forms PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 7, 2004 and July 16, 2004, thereby indicating consideration of the references cited therein.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/698,143
Attorney Docket No. Q60866

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Billy Carter Raulerson

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 1, 2004